



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Sanctuary System
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary
175 Edward Foster Rd.
Scituate, MA 02055
(781) 545-8026 FAX: (781) 545-8036

8SAC MINUTES

8th SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
Clarion Nantasket Beach Hotel Hull, MA
1 October 2003

MINUTES OF MEETING

PRESENT

William Adler	
Regina Asmutis	(Alternate to Susan Farady)
Peter Auster	
Peter Borrelli	
Priscilla Brooks	
Gib Chase	(Alternate to Pricilla Brooks)
Kevin Chu	
Susan Farady	
Jerry Hill	
CDR Greg Hitchen	
Porter Hoagland	(Alternate for Mason Weinrich)
Donald Hourrihan	(Alternate to John Williamson)
Paul Howard	(Ex-Officio Member)
Judith Pederson	(Alternate to Peter Auster)
Kathi Rodriguez	(Designee for Patricia Kurkul) (Ex-Officio Member)
David Slocum	
Susan Snow-Cutter	
Mason Weinrich	
John Williamson	
Sally Yozell	

SBNMS and NATIONAL PROGRAM STAFF

Craig MacDonald, Superintendent	Ben Haskell	Kate Van Dine
Nathalie Ward	Dave Wiley	Anne Smrcina
Columbine Culberg		

OTHERS PRESENT

Richard Taylor	George Upton
Rosemarie Bradley	John Shipman



I. Welcome and Approval Minutes (John Williamson)

- Approval of 6th and 7th SAC Minutes (**MOTION**)
- Review of Agenda

II. Sanctuary Report (Craig MacDonald)

- MacDonald thanked Susan Snow-Cotter and Paul Howard for making presentations at the National Marine Sanctuaries Program (NMSP) Leading Team (LT) meeting
- LT Meeting held at SBNMS with meetings in Boston (8-12 September), featuring reception at New England Aquarium hosted by the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) and a whale watch in Plymouth cosponsored by the NMSF and the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), both including Council members
- Portland Conference to be held Portland, Maine, 6-8 November, at the Portland Harbor Museum (Southern Maine Community College)
- Update on Scituate facility with renovations completed by November/December 2003
- National Updates and Programs: Member requested that SBNMS partnerships be mentioned in relevant brochures, posters, telepresence programs as well as National Headquarters Reports

III. SAC Business (Nathalie Ward)

Council Recruitment (**MOTION**)

Announcement that SAC member seats available including: (1) Member {Mobile Gear-Commercial Fishing}, and (4) Alternates {Education (2), Fixed Gear (1), and Recreation (1)}. Discussion whether Alternates should be consulted during the selection of a new Member's seat. The **MOTION** was adopted that the Executive Committee and the Superintendent would serve as the subcommittee for reviewing candidates for SAC Membership recruitment.

Guest Speakers

Ward asked the membership to provide suggestions for future luncheon speakers.

IV. Working Group Membership (Craig MacDonald)

Membership

MacDonald reported that there were over 400 nominations, (with 250 individual nominations for approximately 190 seats)

Membership Selection

Williamson (on behalf of the Executive Committee) presented the "Protocol for Formation of Working Groups ." (See meeting documents)

Communication and Public Relations

Concerns were voiced that communication to the public throughout the Working Group (WG) process will be a challenge for the Staff. General discussion followed regarding best mechanisms to announce WG logistics and schedules to the public as it was imperative to get information to the public in a timely and informative manner. Staff stated that the SBNMS website is being

updated and would post announcements for a) MPR Process and b) individual WGs. Williamson suggested that Headquarters could assist with public relations.

Public Process

Discussion centered on the public process of WGs including the following queries:

- Can substantive summaries of WG meeting discussions be posted on the web so that stakeholders (who are not WG members) can be part of the process?
- Would there be a means for those stakeholders to respond to discussions?
- How would the Chair evaluate that input?
- How does one “filter” inappropriate comments or establish fairness in response?

The following requests that may assist concerns expressed were made:

- To facilitate communication, a SBNMS WG website with links to the MPR will be forthcoming.
- To create a mechanism, through website or otherwise, to provide coverage to stakeholder groups and disseminate information in a timely fashion.

Council members were asked to email lists of organizations to “alert” to Ward.

Chair Role

Discussed role of SAC Chair as a “guardian” to insure a fair process so that all interests are heard and valued appropriately, as well as directing WG proceedings to stay within the scope of the meeting purview.

Travel Compensation

Travel compensation cannot be provided to WG members due to programmatic financial constraints. Luncheon and coffee breaks (and “extraordinary circumstances” may be considered), and will be paid for by the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF).

V. Site Characterization Workshop

Porter Hoagland gave a brief report on the Site Characterization Workshop which included reviewing the existing data sets, and identifying others sources of analysis that would be useful in the MPR. The SAC questioned how the data can best be used and distributed. MacDonald stated two contractors had been hired to present data analysis interactively in order to facilitate discussion and understanding by the WGs.

VI. *Working Lunch: “Site Characterization of SBNMS”* (Ben Cowrie-Haskell)

Haskell and Wiley presented an overview of specific geological, biological and oceanographic data sets and identified gaps. (See Site Characterization Workshop Report). Members suggested additional data analyses including DAMOS (Disposal Area Monitoring System, a project of the New England Division of Army Corps of Engineers); and, reiterated the importance of defining what data “are or aren’t.” Discussion reflected the following concerns regarding data sets and their best use:

- It is important to separate science and policy.
- How best to ensure broad resource protection — advocating the precautionary principle — in the absence of scientific certainty and if unable to recommend specific actions.

VII. *National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF)*

Lori Aguelles, Director of the NMSF, explained the history of the NMSF, outlined their goals and objectives; described their past financial contributions and involvement with SBNMS; stated their hope to identify partnership opportunities, offered access to expertise through the NMSF’s Board of Directors; and, expressed their future commitment to secure funding for SBNMS. Questions followed concerning NMSF branding and which audiences the NMSF targeted.

VIII. *Working Group Process* (Craig MacDonald)

MacDonald expressed his hope that the working group process not be impeded by the need to know everything at once. The Council will have ample opportunity to voice concerns and offer constructive advice throughout the process. The Sanctuary is limited by financial, technological and temporal constraints. The most productive path is to accept these limitations and advance with the information at hand, assess present obstacles, and seek solutions to the most pressing problems.

Regarding the preparation of the “Goals and Problem Statements” document (as requested by the Council at the 7th SAC, June 16th meeting), the first step for each Team Lead (staff) was to link the public scoping concerns with specific problem statements. The staff prepared the “Goals and Problem Statements document” to include an overarching goal (as mandated from the National Marine Sanctuary Act’s principles) and a generalized problem statement. The list of questions under each issue category attend to issue-specific public concerns. One of the first tasks of each working group will involve culling out the “real” problems from the “perceived” problems.

IX. *Working Group Goals and Problem Statements* (Kate Van Dine)

Chair and Team Lead Meeting

Van Dine presented an overview for the scheduled October 29th meeting — WG Chairs and Team Leads. The objective of the meeting is to provide the terms of reference for WGs. The meeting will review the WG relationships with the SAC; clarify roles and responsibilities of WG members; discuss goals and objectives, and decision-making method; develop ground rules for WG to facilitate effective meetings and conflict management. Additionally, there will be a review of steps for meeting preparation including agenda development and timeline, performance measures, rapporteur reports, technical advisors, constituent involvement, and development of action plans.

Questions regarding WG participation included:

- Can WG members miss meetings?
- Are alternates allowed to substitute for WG members?
- Should decisions about specifics be decided across-the-board or be on a case-by-case basis per WG?
- How will risk-adverse decision-making be dealt with in WGs?
- Does every management action have to address a problem?
- Can actions simply address resource protection?

Discussion

Let the record reflect the Amended addition from 9th SAC meeting by Peter Auster:

Noted that there was a discussion that the working groups develop a range of alternatives for each issues and leave to the SC to choose the preferred alternative that would be forwarded to the SBNMS. (See email 15 Dec 2003; 14:21 to nward@mbl.edu.

Decision-Making

Van Dine elaborated on the consensus-based decision making process, and introduced various definitions of “consensus” provided by the joint MPR California process. Members offered a variety of opinions as how best to achieve “agreement” and pointed out difficult situations that might require a NEPA analysis. Discussion continued concerning best ways to advance WG “recommendations” — the range of alternatives — pertaining to an issue and how best to prioritize them. It was emphasized that the WG Chair and Team Lead must record how decisions are made to track information for possible NEPA analysis. It was also noted that if an issue is pertinent to two groups, it is essential that those WG Chairs and Team Leads coordinate.

Problem Statement

It was suggested that the “problem statement” would more accurately be called the “issue addressed.” It was pointed out that the term “issue” is reserved for the issues raised in scoping and prioritized by the SAC and the Sanctuary Program. In contrast, the problem statement can refer to multiple issues organized under a single WG.

WG Action Plan

WGs will develop Action Plans (AP) to address priority issues. APs may identify and recommend specific actions, strategies, tools or techniques to accomplish each objective. A reminder that the action plan is predicated on the dual SBNMS goals of resource protection and compatible use. In-depth discussion ensued regarding the definition of an action plan and subsequent semantical terms such as “goals, objectives, recommendation, alternatives, etc. Questions concerning the WGs role in NEPA analysis followed.

Half Term Review of MPR

Noted that the February 10th SAC meeting would focus on a mid-term review of WG status.

SUMMARY

In sum, it was agreed that that the Problem Statement document may serve as a first-step exercise for team building in the WG process; and, that those members who would like to offer comments for revision should send them to Ward by October 3.

X. Other Council Business

- SAC Chairs and Team Leads WG meeting: 29 October 2003
- Portland Update
- Request the Council to the New England Fisheries Management Council (NEFMC) via Paul Howard to include the Sanctuary boundaries on all future charts, maps and

relevant fisheries documents in the Gulf of Maine, and Kathi Rodrigues on behalf of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)agreed to do likewise.

- Announcements:

Noted that Amendment 13 comment periods is end of October.

DRAFT 8SAC MINUTES

XI. Public Comment

Richard Taylor noted that the Mobile Gear seat is not represented on the Council.

XII. Adjourn

MOTIONS

- Adopted Minutes from 6th SAC and 7th SAC (Chu)
- Executive Committee serves as subcommittee for reviewing candidates for SAC Membership recruitment (Williamson)

COUNCIL REMINDERS

- *Council members were asked to email lists of organizations to “alert” to SBNMS Working Group process to Ward.*
- *In sum, it was agreed that that the Problem Statement document may serve as a first-step exercise for team building in the WG process; and, that those members who would like to offer comments for revision should send them to Ward by October 3.*